DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 412 CG 028 982

AUTHOR	Simpson, F. Morgan
TITLE	Professor-in-Residence: Redefining the Work of Teacher Educators.
PUB DATE	1997-07-00
NOTE	9p.; In: China-U.S. Conference on Education. Collected Papers. (Beijing, People's Republic of China, July 9-13, 1997); see CG 028 968.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

Traditional teacher preparation programs are based on a theory-practice format, which means that the college student begins with the coursework (theory) and moves through various stages of practice to becoming a teacher. Efforts to introduce relevance in teacher preparation programs have included student teaching and internships, laboratory schools, microteaching opportunities, the use of video technology, case studies, and field-based experience. Sources of variability in the quality of these experiences are discussed. Hiring university faculty with significant K-12 teaching experience is one way to provide relevance in teacher education. A model of teacher preparation through exchange of faculty between universities and school systems is described. The "teacher-in-residence" program provides relevance for university students. Active teachers are hired as full-time university faculty members. For a period of 2 years they teach courses, supervise interns, and perform the functions of university faculty; then they return to the public schools. The "professor-in-residence" program provides the opportunity for university faculty to teach in schools. The author's experience as a professor in residence is described. Such exchanges benefit schools and teacher preparation programs by bringing a fresh perspective and a dose of reality to each. (EMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 425 412

Chapter Fourteen

Professor-In-Residence: Redefining the Work of Teacher Educators

F. Morgan Simpson

Abstract

Montgomery Public Schools (Montgomery, Alabama, USA) was awarded a BellSouth Foundation grant to establish two Professional Development Schools (PDS). The grant also supported the appointment of two Professors-in-Residence (PIRs) in the PDSs. This paper focuses on the role of the PIRs in bridging the gap between the university teacher preparation program and the elementary PDS.

F. Morgan Simpson was one of the PIRs and he spent two half-days a week at Morningview Elementary School working with teachers and students. Simpson taught sample lessons for elementary teachers and worked with beginning teachers. He also worked with specific elementary students, many times the problem students, in an attempt to change attitudes and behavior. Simpson's background in secondary education mathematics served as both a curse and a blessing to his responsibilities as a PIR.

The PIR served in an idealistic position where he had opportunities to influence both the worlds of practice and theory. The PIR was able to witness and document first hand the current work of practicing teachers and K-6 student needs. The PIR was also able to reflect upon the effectiveness of his own teacher preparation program in preparing interns and beginning teachers. The PIR followed preprofessional educators through the preparation program and examined the effectiveness in the internship. In one case, Simpson was able to observe one student matriculate from an introduction to education course through the internship at the school and finally become a first year teacher at Morningview Elementary School.

The teacher preparation programs have changed over time to include various approaches to introduce the preservice teacher to the classroom. When this writer was initially prepared as a secondary mathematics teacher, the only time he spent in the schools prior to the internship was for a brief two-week in-school field observation between the junior and senior years of college. Today's prospective teachers experience extensive time in a school setting. This paper is about various changes in the teacher preparation programs and more specifically about the experiences I had serving as a Professor-In-Residence at Morningview Elementary School in Montgomery, Alabama.

CG028982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Walz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Practice Component in Teacher Preparation Programs

Traditional teacher preparation programs are based on a theory-practice format. This means the college student begins with course work (the theory) taken at the higher education institution, then

through various means the student is allowed to practice the ideas learned in the courses. Gehrke (1987) reported that these experiences provide the prospective teacher a realistic experience in teaching so that they may decide whether to continue pursuing a teaching career.

Efforts to include a practice component in the preparation program have varied over the years. These efforts to introduce relevance in the teacher preparation programs have included student teaching (internship), laboratory schools, microteaching, video taping, case studies, and field experiences. Each of these are briefly described.

Student Teaching (internship). The internship is a time where the college student is assigned to work full-time in the school setting with an experienced classroom teacher. The intern is supervised by both a classroom teacher and a university supervisor. The intern is able to experience the realities of the classroom in a nurturing climate with support and encouragement. The internship represents the culminating activity in the preparation of new teachers. The quality of the student teaching experience is dependent upon the quality of the classroom sites that in many cases are not designed to prepare teachers and are beyond the control of the higher education institution. Therefore, additional experiences prior to the internship are required to acquaint the preservice student to the teaching profession.

Laboratory Schools. Laboratory schools were created on college campuses to teach both K12 students and to provide experiences for the preparation of future teachers. The college students were able to observe K-12 students and teachers as well as observe demonstration lessons taught by university faculty. During the 1960's and 1970's the need for university students to see normal classrooms and financial problems in higher education resulted in the gradual elimination of many of laboratory schools (McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996). The current trend of creating collaborative agreements between universities and local school districts resulting in professional development schools is similar to the laboratory school programs.

Microteaching. Microteachng is where preservice teachers present a brief 15 to 20 minute lesson to a small group of students who are usually peers. This allows the student to practice specific teaching skills under a limited controlled environment. Jensen and Young (1972) found students that completed microteaching activities presented more meaningful lessons and created better classroom climate during the intemship than those students not participating in microteaching activities. Additional research report there were no significant differences between students participating in microteaching activities and those not participating (Copeland & Doyle, 1973). Thus, additional techniques to provide relevance to the teacher preparation program are needed.

Video Technology. Video technology with or without computer interactions have been introduced in the preparation programs. At first video equipment was used to tape and review sample lessons. The tapes could be demonstrations/model lessons or even microteaching lessons. Winitsky and Arends (1991) reported that video taped demonstrations were as effective as viewing a live lesson.

Some universities and publishing companies are using interactive videodisk technology. This videodisk and computer allows the prospective teacher to view demonstrations or critical events from actual K-12 classrooms and interact with the materials through the computer and thus experience situations that may not be available to them in their field experiences. Studies have reported the effectiveness of interactive video in developing reflective clinical reasoning (Copeland, 1989). Goldman and Barron (1990) found that students using the videodisk technology in a mathematics methods course were more confident in presenting mathematics lessons after viewing and analyzing video demonstrations. The use of this technology in the teacher preparation program can be useful in developing a reflective teacher.

Case Studies. The use of case studies is an additional attempt to bring reality to the preparation of teachers. The presentation of cases can be through written or video formats. Cases provide students the opportunity to examine realistic situations and consider the relevant factors as they become aware of their beliefs about teaching and learning (Harrington, 1990-1991). Students test their own conceptions of teaching and students when using case studies.

Field-Based Experience. Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik (1990) reported the typical teacher education program in the United States consists of course work, various field experiences, and student teaching. In the field experience component, the prospective teacher is assigned to a specific teacher and school setting for brief periods of time (usually for 10 to 15 hours at a time). The students are given specific responsibilities for each field experience, and the responsibilities are dependent upon the specific course work assignment. Field experiences are popular because they link prospective teachers with the actual K-12 classroom, provide opportunities for one-onone teaching encounters, and the college student is inducted into the existing school climate. These experiences allow prospective teachers to discover early in the program if they like children and want to teach, to permit university faculty to determine students' potential, and to allow university students to practice instructional skills prior to the internship (McIntyre, 1983).

Most universities involve a large number of preservice teachers and their placement in classrooms. As a result of the number of needed placements, the universities are not able to control the quality of the field placements. Also the preservice teacher, the cooperating teacher, and universityinstructors may lack a common goal. The university wants the prospective teacher to observe and participate in activities that reinforce the topics being taught on campus. The preservice teacher often lacks suffficient experience to know what to examine in the field-based classroom plus how to properly interpret what they see in the classroom. Sometimes the preservice teacher observes practices that contradict

what the university instructor was teaching. Some preservice teachers question the need for field-based experiences. Ideally, preservice teachers should have opportunities to work with different types of students and classroom teachers, and participate in classrooms that are representative of the ones in which they might find employment.

Metcalf and Kahlich (1996) reported that laboratory experiences are more effective with inservice teachers than with preservice teachers. Inservice teachers' view of the value of field experiences equal those of preservice teachers, and changes in behavior, knowledge, or attitudes are as strong or stronger.

Relevance Component in Teacher Preparation Program

Relevance is obtained in the teacher preparation program through means other then just the practice component of the preparation program. Relevance can be achieved primarily through the faculty, the teacher educators themselves. It begins with hiring faculty with sign)ficant K-12 experiences. The selection of faculty with several years of experience and leadership in the K-12 school setting is important to both the development of the teacher preparation program and to their own personal credibility in the university classroom.

Teacher-In-Residence.

At my institution, Auburn University at Montgomery, we created a Teacher-in-Residence (TIR) program. We bring two, sometimes three, full-time teachers from Montgomery Public Schools to join the university School of Education faculty for a two year period of time. The Teachers-in-Residence teach courses in the School of Education and supervise interns. They are full partners in the normal activities of university faculty. The only activity they do not participate is the academic advising of students. At the completion of the two years, they return to a classroom in one of the public schools of Montgomery. While on the college campus the TIRs present seminars and work with students beyond the students enrolled in their classes. We found the TIRs to be excellent university teachers and good colleagues.

Professor-In-Residence.

The next logical step was for us to involve university faculty as faculty in the Montgomery County public schools. This opportunity was available through a grant from the BellSouth Foundation. A BellSouth Foundation grant to Montgomery Public Schools and the Auburn University at Montgomery School of Education created a Professor-In-Residence (PIR) at two elementary schools (Morningview and Harrison Elementary Schools). This partnership between the university and school district also designated the two elementary schools as Professional Development Schools as part of the grant.

I was selected as one of the PIRs. The selection process required the candidates to make presentations to the faculty at the two schools, then the school faculty selected the person they wanted to serve as their PIR. I was selected by the faculty at Morningview Elementary School and I spent two half-days a week at the school for two years (1994-95 and 1995-96). This service as a PIR was both rewarding and challenging.

As a person with a background in secondary mathematics education as well as a high school principal, I found working in an elementary school was both challenging and rewarding. I had worked with elementary teachers and students when I served as a mathematics supervisor, but the reality of working with K-6 teachers and students on a weekly basis was at first frightening.

The principal asked that I work with both students and teachers. Some of my time each day was structured and some of my time was unstructured. I was assigned to work with the fourth grade teachers, so some of my time was spent teaching fourth grade students various Stanford Achievement Test skills. I attended all faculty meetings and I met with the fourth grade faculty at their grade level meetings. At the end of my two years, it was the fourth grade students and faculty that gave me the most pleasing gift of appreciation.

The principal also allowed me the flexibility to visit any of the forty-one classrooms in the school. I would make random visits to the other classrooms in the school. Many of the teachers requested that I come to teach a demonstration lesson or to just read a library book to the students. I developed patterns of classrooms that I would visit, and I discovered there was one kindergarten class I always visited upon arriving at the school. There was one fifth grade class I visited each week so that I could take a weekly mathematics test along with the students. I was asked to work with the sixth grade students on a special project. So, some of the time I spent in the school I served as a demonstration teacher and at other times I served as a cheerleader, encouraging the students to do their best.

I was given the task of working with some problem sixth grade students. There were five boys which were difficult for the teachers to handle. I attempted various activities with them and I am not sure I did any good. One of the best activities I tried was when I took them to another school so they could read to four and five-year-old children enrolled at a Head Start Center. In the new setting they behaved as ideal young men and were excellent examples of perfect behavior. I normally go to this Head Start Center to read to the children and was very pleased that involving these sixth grade students worked so well. After we returned to Morningview, I was constantly asked by other sixth grade students to take them to read.

Students in the teacher preparation program were assigned to visit Morningview as part of a field-laboratory assignment or as interns. I made sure the university students enrolled in my Introduction to Education course were assigned to spend the field laboratory time at Morningview. So as a university representative in the school, I made sure students participated in various activities. In the university classroom I often discussed with the students events we witnessed at Morningview. In this way I could make sure the students did not misunderstand or were aware of many activities which lab students frequently miss. While I was not the university supervisor for the elementary interns assigned to Morningview, I was able to assist the interns in working through many of their problems. I was not responsible for their supervision, so for many of the interns I was able to be their professional friend and a part of their support system.

I felt a need to involve my university colleagues in the work at Morningview. As I interacted with the faculty at the university I was constantly telling them about incidents at Morningview. They soon began to expect me to interject some story about what I was experiencing on a regular basis. I was able to get several of them to visit the school. One colleague became a substitute teacher at the school and another began visiting the school on a regular basis. At the end of the experience, the school superintendent granted permission for the university faculty to become involved with the Morningview students and staff in various action research projects. I regret to say that in the fall of 1996, I had a change in my job responsibilities which did not allow for my weekly visits to Morningview. This area of involving university faculty along with the Morningview faculty and students in research projects would produce a lasting link between the university at the school. I regret that I had to give up this assignment before I was able to involve more of my university colleagues in this relationship with Morningview Elementary School.

Working as the PIR, I was able to gain the K-6 faculty perspective. The Morningview faculty was critical of the way university students were assigned to their classroom as part of the field laboratory component. The university student would come to the school and attempt to just observe in the classroom. The university professor had wanted the student to teach a portion of the lesson or even to work with a group of elementary students on a project. As the PIR, I discovered that the expectations for the field laboratory experiences were not communicated to the K-6 faculty. Once this problem was corrected, the faculty at both the university and the elementary school were pleased with the quality of the experiences. The K-6 faculty enjoyed being involved in designing appropriate activities for the lab students, and the university faculty enjoyed suggestions from the practicing professionals.

My background in secondary mathematics education served as both a curse and as a blessing. Not being directly involved in the preparation of the elementary teachers prevented me from carryingmy university classes to Morningview School. The other person (Dr. Lynne Mills) selected as the PIR at Harrison Elementary School was able to involve her university students with the school faculty and students. She was able to teach portions of her courses at Harrison Elementary School, and her students were able to interact with elementary students. This interaction between university student and the elementary student resulted in an excellent preparation for her preservice elementary teachers. She was also able to have one classroom at Harrison Elementary School equipped as a resource room for the Harrison faculty and this room served as a place for the university students to prepare their instructional materials. Dr. Mills was very successful at blending the university students and the elementary school faculty and students. Dr. Mills and I continually reviewed what we were doing as PIRs and I was very envious of her successes. However, I was able to use my experiences in the teaching of mathematics to show students and faculty at Moringview several new ideas. I taught several demonstration lessons in the area of mathematics. The teachers were appreciative and I was frequently being asked for ideas of how to teach

different topics. There were no vacant classrooms at Morningview Elementary, so I was not able to bring the university students to Morningview. However, I was able to bring the sixth grade students to the university. We provided a day of activities and demonstrations for the sixth grade students in May, 1996.

I was pleased to discover that beginning in the fall of 1996, a new first year teacher at Morningview Elementary School was a recent graduate of our teacher education program. I first met her as a student in the introduction to education course I teach. I was able to follow this student as she matriculated through the preparation program. She completed her internship at Morningview in one of the fourth grade classes in which I visited. I was very pleased to see firsthand the development of this new teacher. I only wish I had been with her during her first year of teaching. She will be an outstanding addition to our beloved profession.

I was able to interject into my class discussions examples and situations which I saw at Morningview Elementary School. These recent experiences were excellent for the university student to examine. The university students select teaching as a career choice for rather idealistic reasons, and they need to become aware of problems which today's teachers must face. University faculty are criticized by some because they claim we do not understand the current conditions in schools. This experience as a PIR at Morningview have reinforced the idea that some conditions ***are*** different and I have a greater appreciation for the work of elementary school teachers. I would like to think that this experience has forced me to become more realistic about the working conditions in K-6 schools today. I met the world of practice through the PIR experiences and I believe I have some ideas that will work in the K-6 setting.

Summary

The teacher preparation programs includes different activities directed at bringing reality to the prospective teacher. These include activities such as microteachng, video technology, case studies, and field-based experiences. Two additional programs are excellent in bringing reality into the preparation program. A Teacher-In-Residence program can bring the practicing professional to the university classrooms, but the focus of this paper was the Professor-In-Residence program. This allowed a university professor to assume the faculty duties in a K-6 school. These experiences became for this writer both challenging and refreshing. Both the K-6 school and the university benefited from the program.

References

Copeland, W. (1989). Technology-mediated laboratory experiences and the development of clinical reasoning in novice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education. 40,* 10- 18.

Copeland, W., & Doyle, W. (1973). Laboratory skill training and student teacher classroom performance. *Journal of Experimental Education. 42*(1), 16-21.

Gehrke, N. J. (1987). *On being a teacher.* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Goldman, E., & Barron, L. (1990). Using hypermedia to improve the preparation of elementary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education. 41, 21 - 31.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (1990). *Place where teachers are taught.* San Francisco: Josee-Bass.

Harrington, H. (1990-1991). The case as method. *Action in Teacher Education. 12*(4), 1-6.

Jensen, L., & Young, J. (1972). Effect of televised simulated instruction on subsequent teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 63,* 368-373.

McIntyre, D. J. (1983). *Field experiences in teacher education: From student to teacher.* Washington, DC: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Metcalf, K. K., & Kahlich, P. A. (1996). Laboratory experiences as transition from campus to field. In D. J. McIntyre, & D. M. Byrd (Eds.), *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience* (pp.97-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Winitsky, N., & Arends, R. (1991). Translating research into practice: The effects of various forms of training and clinical experience on preservice students' knowledge, skill, and reflectiveness. *Journal of Teacher Education. 42,* 52-65.